



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee**

of the
Metropolitan Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized Area

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau
Louis Foster
Susan Kairalla
Christine Leduc
Amado Leon
Gabrielle Redfern
Claudia Schmid
Larry Thorson
Eric Tullberg

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW 1 Street, #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-1647

www.miamidade.gov/mpo



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

S.P. CLARK CENTER
111 NW 1 ST.
18TH FLOOR - CONFERENCE ROOM 3
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33128

AGENDA

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2006
AT 5:30 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2006
- III. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. PUBLIC WORKS UPDATE – P. Morales, M-DPW
 - B. FDOT PROJECTS UPDATE – K. Jeffries, FDOT
 - C. DORAL BIKEWAY NETWORK PLAN – S. Robertson, KHA
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. B/P PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS WORKSHOP – D. Henderson
- V. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. 3/4 PROGRESS REPORT – D. Henderson
- VI. MEMBER COMMENTS

***REMINDER: THE NOVEMBER MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
THE 3RD WEDNESDAY (15TH) IN CONFERENCE ROOM 18-2.***

It is the policy of Miami Dade County to comply with all of the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The facility is accessible. For sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or materials in accessible format, please call 305-375-4507 at least five business days in advance.

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Bibeau
Susan Kairalla
Christine Leduc
Amado Leon
Gabrielle Redfern
Eric Tullberg

MEMBERS ABSENT

Claudia Schmid
Ted Silver
Larry Thorson
Louis Foster

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff
Jae Manzella, Staff
Jeff Cohen, M-DPW
Priscilla Morales, M-DPW
Ken Jeffries, FDOT
Robert Walker, Doral P&R

Stewart Robertson, Kimely-Horn

Julio Boucle, URS Corp.

The meeting began at 5:45 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	- DH: Since TS was not attending, he asked ET to act as Chair. Also, the Progress Report was still in draft form, so he asked for <i>this to be presented at the November meeting</i> . GR: <i>Motion approving the revised Agenda; seconded by BB; vote – unanimous.</i>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- BB: <i>Motion approving the Minutes of 10/25/6; seconded by AL; vote – unanimous.</i>
FDOT PROJECTS UPDATE	- JB: CS had made comments/suggestions regarding the recently-completed SW 27 Av. project. He did a field review to address her concerns. ET: Some new medians don't have cut-outs to let bicyclists/pedestrians cross the street. JB: Where medians have been closed, people will have to cross at signalized intersections. The design controls motorized movements and reduces conflict points. ET: The design negates the movement of people, including the handicapped, wanting to cross the road at these closed-off intersections. Traveling to the signal is inconvenient. SK: This is a safety issue, rather than convenience. JB: The proximity of the nearest signalized intersection is very close. The medians have un-landscaped spaces that people can walk through. BB: Although there is a lot of ROW, and this was a major reconstruction, bike lanes were not included. These would have tied-into the proposed bike lanes on the SW 27 Av. project, just south of this area. Inquired why this project was not presented to the BPAC. KJ: Does not have an answer at this time. BB: Was told that the FDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator was expected to bring these projects to the BPAC. The safety of bicyclists seems to have been discounted. KJ: Although bicycling is supposed to be considered for all projects, project mgrs. need to be educated. This project fell through that gap. BB: Inquired how considerations for bicyclists can be improved. This is just one example. Other FDOT districts are constructing bike lanes. KJ: The scope-of-works are not comprehensive. Once projects are designed, they are hard to change. This is a challenge. This was just a safety project. GR: Inquired if building the medians required reconstruction of the roadway. KJ: Yes. JC: However, drainage and other major reconstruction were not done. JB: There isn't a lot of ROW. BB: The point is: these projects should be presented in a timely manner to the BPAC. The 6 fatalities along this corridor indicate that pedestrian safety is an issue. KJ: Since he's been working as B/P Coordinator there have only been a few projects

addressing bicycle mobility, such as: Sunny Isles, and 5 St. in Miami Beach. He does not have the authority to make project mgrs. add bicycle amenities. The Plans Preparation Manual says “should” instead of “shall” (consider bicycle mobility), which is the problem.

BB: *Suggested KJ to start presenting all his projects to the BPAC.*

JB: That would be around 15-20 per month.

GR: Inquired, out of those, how many are designed with bicycle facilities.

KJ: That is left to the discretion of the project mgrs. There is an electronic procedure for everyone to comment on/review all projects; but, it is not a perfect system.

PM: Project mgrs. need to be pressured. She fought for bicyclists on Biscayne Blvd.

BB: That project never came before the BPAC either.

GR: Out of all the FDOT plans, extremely-rarely do they have bike lanes.

KJ: He receives the plans at 30%, and tries to work with the project mgrs; however, they have to stick to their budgets.

JB: The only opportunity to add bike lanes along SW 27 Av. would be to remove parking. The median is 16’ wide, the travel lanes are 11’; these are the minimums. Unless the curb was moved, there isn’t space for bike lanes.

BB: The process isn’t being followed. The BPAC is supposed to review projects. If there are constraints, let them be known; yet, let bicycle facilities be considered as per the law.

JK: Some projects do not relate to bicycling; and he would not be able to bring the project mgr. in to present many others.

SK: *Suggested making a list of projects for the BPAC to review and choose which seem like likely candidates for presentation.*

JB: That sounds like the FDOT Work Program.

ET: *DH could review this and determine the presentation potential.*

JK: Suggested putting DH on the Review/Comments electronic listing. Inquired if DH receives review opportunities for all M-DPW projects.

PM: When the project calls for bicycle amenities he does.

JC: When DH recommends bicycle amenities, the project mgrs. try hard to include them. If his recommendation is less than committed, it is up to the project mgrs.

GR: Inquired why there are a lot of bike lanes in Broward.

JC: They have a different ROW acquisition program. Additionally, when District 6 (Miami-Dade/Monroe) was formed, they acquired many narrow roads/ROW, which they now have to reconstruct using State standards.

BB: Inquired as to flexibility in the standards.

PM: AASHTO provides more flexibility than FDOT’s Plans Preparation Manual.

BB: At times, instead of bike lanes, the BPAC has offered compromises of just 2 extra feet for a shoulder to make the roads safer for cycling. He questioned the assertion that SW 24 Av. could not have been designed with extra space for cycling.

JC: (Reviewing the typical section) Reducing features, such as medians and parking bays to minimum measurements would have provided a wider outside lane.

PM: There possibly could have been enough room for bike lanes.

GR: *Requested the FDOT restripe the roadway.*

PM: The installation of bulb-outs would pose a problem.

GR: Cut outs could alleviate that concern.

BB: *Requested the plans for SW 27 Av. to be provided to the BPAC for further review.*

GR: *Motion requesting FDOT to restripe SW 27 Av., north of US-1, to provide a bicycle-friendly design, including bulb-out and median reductions, which compliments the proposed design for SW 27 Av., south of US-1; seconded by BB; vote – unanimous.*

JB: In reference to Krome Av., there are about 5 typical section design proposals. This

	<p>project is 34 miles from Okeechobee Rd. to US-1. <i>From US to I-Lucy St. it will be widened to 4-lanes, as well as bike lanes.</i></p> <p>ET: Concerned with the (currently being built) MDT South Dade Trl. project, which will cross Krome Av.; then, turn southerly to US-1; afterwards the path will simply dead-end, short of US-1. Inquired how long before the FDOT project is constructed.</p> <p>KJ: <i>Funding is for 2010, but it can be delayed a few years, due to construction costs.</i></p> <p>ET: When that is done they'll rip-out this new path.</p> <p>JB: <i>From Lucy to SW 6 Sts. will be a center turn-lane, plus bike lanes and parking bays.</i></p> <p>ET: Pointed-out that the drawings don't show parking bays.</p> <p>JB: <i>Between SW 6 St. to Flagler Av., the same design will be used, except the sidewalks are wider on one side. The section through downtown Homestead will remain the same as it is, because of historic designation. The sidewalks are 19' wide.</i></p> <p>JC: Suggested making a pattern on the sidewalk, next to the edge marked for bicyclists.</p> <p>ET: That area will probably have planters or other street furniture.</p> <p>JC: An alternative is to eliminate the left turn-lane, giving room for bike lanes.</p> <p>JB: Those turn-lanes are essential for traffic flow. <i>From SW 4 St. to Avocado Dr., the center turn-lanes and bike lanes reappear.</i> From Avocado to Howard Drs., there are a few typical sections being proposed; however, <i>each of them contain a 12' multi-use path on the western edge of the corridor, separated several feet from the roadway. From Howard Dr. to Okeechobee Rd., the bikeway will be along the canal.</i></p> <p>ET: Inquired if this is a different design than what was shown at the Krome Av.- North public hearing; where the path was far away from the corridor, along the levee.</p> <p>JB: From Okeechobee Rd. to Tamiami Trl. the levee is far away from Krome Av.</p> <p>ET: Concerned that is approximately a mile. <i>There have to be connections to Krome Av. along this span.</i> Also, the Black Creek Trl. will be constructed to cross Krome Av. near SW 112 St., <i>so provisions for the trail have to be made at this point.</i></p> <p>KJ: He is researching various surfaces to determine the best for the trail along the levee, as well as access points. Broward's Bicycle Coordinator received approval from SFWMD for surface engineering of their levees. SFWMD has many concerns: from people falling off the levees, to them feeding alligators. There already is a lot of illegal activity going on.</p> <p>ET: As the Krome Trl. becomes popular, more people will discourage illegal activities. If the trail is security monitored, this would do more to eliminate these activities.</p> <p>BB: <i>Suggested security to monitor the trail.</i></p> <p>ET: <i>Suggested bollards at intersections to restrict cars/ATVs from entering the trail.</i></p> <p>JC: Horse gates were installed along the SDGN to do so.</p> <p>ET: <i>Asked DH & JC to determine a signage/routing strategy for cyclists unfamiliar with the area where the South Dade Trl. ends.</i></p> <p>JC: <i>He will also be discussing this conundrum with KJ.</i></p>
M-DPW PROJECTS UPDATE	<p>- PM: <i>Along SW 216 St., from SW 127 Av. to SW 112 Av., there will continuous bike lanes. There will be a public meeting on November 30th.</i></p> <p>ET: This corridor meets up with the Black Creek and South Dade Trls.</p> <p>PM: From SW 112 Av. to H.E.F.T., is a resurfacing project; bike lanes won't be installed.</p> <p>JC: Depending on which old plans being referenced, County Bike Route 1 either used SW 216 St., or used sidewalks further south to meet-up with US-1. A separate project proposes a path along the northern swale of SW 216 St. towards the H.E.F.T. to meet with the existing path along the canal, northwest towards US-1. A bridge along this route would probably be something that cannot be retrofitted.</p> <p>PM: <i>Another project along SW 264 St. would connect the S. Dade Trl. to the proposed</i></p>

	<p><i>extension of the Tallahassee Trl.</i></p> <p>JC: This corridor has an old, green&white, multi-use legacy path. <i>This project introduces bike lanes</i>, because the legacy path does not meet current standards.</p> <p>PM: This project had a charette process, due to the large amount of ROW acquired. <i>Another project is along SW 176 St.; bike lanes are included.</i></p> <p>JC: <i>Instead of a big round-about, 2 small ones are planned</i>, making it easier to navigate.</p> <p>ET: Provided comments at another meeting.</p> <p>JC: <i>Regarding the Venitian Cswy. project, the middle corridor will be reduced to 2 lanes, using the remaining space for turn-lanes and bike lanes.</i> Although the westbound toll booth gate arm has been cut, there have been complaints about it being too narrow still; so, <i>this will be reviewed. Dashed striping will be added, and “Share the Lane” signs added. The eastbound road to path transition at the toll booth will be smoothened, and may be lengthened to reduce merging hazards. Where residential access roads exist, the bike lanes will follow them</i>, although fast-traveling bicyclists will likely proceed straight along the main line. Turning radii are being reviewed for extra space. <i>Some parking will be eliminated.</i> Some bridges have no extra room for the bike lanes, so the shoulders will serve in these instances. Unfortunately, the draw-bridges have mechanism troughs that can trap bicycle wheels. These gaps have been narrowed, yet may still pose danger; so, <i>diagonal lines may be installed to direct cyclists away from the gaps.</i> The existing “Dismount and Walk Bicycles Across Bridge” should be replaced with a better notification of this hazard. He hopes to be able to connect this facility with the Collins Canal Greenway. Several portions of the end of this route will be redesigned to do so.</p> <p>BB: Commended JC for making things work, instead of thinking it can’t be done.</p> <p>JC: <i>The toll booth area will be first to be improved, very soon. The whole project is expected to be completed in December.</i></p> <p>GR: This project is a great benefit for cyclists. She commended the BPAC for persevering, since the landscaping project is still a few years away.</p> <p>JC: This project separated the bike lane design from that project.</p> <p>KJ: Inquired if the bridges are planned to be refurbished at that time also.</p> <p>JC: <i>Weight limit restrictions will be better enforced. Signs are being installed.</i></p> <p>GR: There needs to be a person to enforce these.</p> <p>JC: All over-weight vehicle drivers are expected to notify the Causeway Office, so that all other vehicles do not use the bridges at these times. The police need to enforce the law.</p> <p>ET: Inquired if anything new has arisen regarding path maintenance.</p> <p>JC: Since there aren’t many available funding sources, PTP seems to be the best candidate. These are descrecionary funds for each County Commissioner. However, several paths cross over a few districts.</p> <p>ET: <i>Suggested the BPAC put focus on Commissioners known to be bicycle-friendly.</i></p> <p>JC: The possibility of using Neat Teams for spot maintenance is being considered. Routine maintance would be very infrequent, so it is important for path users to call 311.</p>
DORAL BIKEWAY NETWORK PLAN	<p>- RW: The City is hoping to expand upon the work URS has developed to integrate parks, streetscapes and land-use planning.</p> <p>SR: The plan consists of a series of off-road, interconnected, multi-use paths, as well as bicycle lanes for both recreation and transportation purposes. <i>The existing park system, and a new major park will serve as trailheads.</i> There are 7 off-road trails: 1) The Atlas Trl runs along an FPL easement. The new high school is accessible from it. 2) The Beacon Trl. was proposed in the NDGP, along NW 25 St. canal ROW. It connects to the Turnpike Trl., and (outside City limits) to the Lake Belt and Perimeter Trls. A few charter schools are served along this route. 3) Dressel’s Dairy Trl. runs along a canal</p>

	<p>ROW, serving as a spine for the most of the other trails. Portions of the ROW will require cooperation from property owners, including the Doral Country Club. 4) The Greenway Trl. runs along another FPL ROW. As with this and other corridors, people already walk or bike along them. 5) The Limestone Trl. runs along another FPL ROW. A developer has offered to build a portion of the trail, which is adjacent to the development. Even without construction of the downtown Doral, there is a lot of potential use from existing multi-residential complexes along the route. 6) The Sunshine Trl. runs along the golf course, and because of available ROW, it can be implemented soon, and create momentum for trail acceptance by the residents. Finally, 7) the Turnpike Trl., which is proposed in the NDGP, runs along the City-side of the H.E.F.T. canal. Several constraints, of which are: the toll facility at NW 41 St., as well as a proposed interchange at NW 74 St., will require creative engineering. It connects to a major park and residential neighborhoods. <i>A public meeting is scheduled for November.</i></p> <p>BB: Commended the City for considering non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>GR: Inquired if there was funding for construction.</p> <p>RW: The Master Plan was developed from PTP funds. The City is only 2-functional years old, and the parks & recreation infrastructure is being started with several bond and grant proposals totaling \$20 million over the next 2-3 years. If mitigation outcomes are favorable, more funds would be available. The City administration and elected officials are very supportive of this endeavor. The total cost has not been calculated.</p> <p>BB: Although the BPAC considers this a great proposal, since it is in the draft stages and yet to be reviewed by the City residents, he asked for this plan to come back (with subsequent revisions) to the BPAC for formal recommendation.</p>
B/P PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS WORKSHOP	<p>- DH: Since TS, who initiated this item, was not present, he would like to delay it until the next meeting. This would also tie-in with well the bicycle facility legislation information, which BB had requested.</p>
MEMBER COMMENTS	<p>-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BB: Florida Statutes use the term “should” instead of “shall” in requiring bicycle accommodations within roadway designs. KJ: Representatives from Delray Beach tried to change this after their community successfully protested a bike lane proposal. That effort failed in the committee process. BB: <i>Requested DH to add this item to the November Agenda, including the proposed amendment.</i> • JC: The Miami Beach Bikeways Committee requested the installation of part-time bike lanes along 41 St., using existing parking bays during the day (off-peak parking hours). He indicated to the group that the FDOT does allow part-time bike lanes. GR: Inquired how something like this could be done. There is plenty of parking space in back of the buildings. Staff from the Parking Authority has told her they would be willing to loose the parking revenue, making it up on parking violations. KJ: Unsure how to proceed. SK: There are many places that offer parking only during certain hours. JC: Suggested prohibiting parking and installing “Share the Road” signage. GR: <i>Requested DH to research this issue and bring ideas to the November meeting.</i> DH: One problem is: this would create uncertainty; predictability is a precept of proper roadway engineering. There are roads that are 3-laned (with bike lanes) during peak hours, and 1 lane turns to parking space during off-peak hours. However, the bike lanes are always available; they simply shift over.

GR: Existing bulb-outs would cause a problem; perhaps cut-outs could be made.
KJ: The same problem arises along Alton Rd., which is slated for reconstruction.
JM: This corridor has been identified in the NDGP for the Atlantic Trl.
KJ: Many stake holders determine roadway design, including the municipalities.

- BB: There has to be a greater interaction between the FDOT, Miami-Dade County and the BPAC. JC has been a regular attendee, and PM is becoming a welcome addition; but, KJ has been absent. *He requested KJ, as FDOT's Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator to attend BPAC meetings on a regular basis.* Tonight's meeting has shown that this type of interaction can be beneficial.
KJ: His function as B/P Coordinator is only a part of the duties he performs. He cannot commit to attending every meeting.
GR: *Motion requesting the FDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator to attend every monthly BPAC meeting; seconded by BB; vote – unanimous.*
- GR: Inquired about holding televised BPAC meetings in the Commission Chambers.
DH: Besides learning that it costs money for the added security and broadcast, he has not received answers to several questions he posed, including budgeting. He hopes to have all these answers for the November meeting.
- GR: The Miami Beach Transportation Subcommittee has been working on a pedicab ordinance for 3 years. *A pilot program is expected within a year.* Police will perform background checks on the operators.
- BB: Inquired as to his concern about funding documentation (provided previously) ending the MDT project at SW 7 St.
DH: That was just a typographical error. *The project ends at the Miami River.*
ET: Was under the impression that this project crosses the river.
BB: That is a separate project.
JC: The City of Miami had proposed a SW 1 Av. tunnel. Although this project is unlikely to be built, he has strongly suggested the inclusion of an M-Path extension within the tunnel.
- ET: SW 184 St. is being 4-laned without sidewalks on the north side.
JC: L&P Thompson Pk. is a preserve. He has discussed improving the park's northwest portion of their pathway network to connect with the Black Creek Trl. project.
ET: Since there is another project for sidewalk repairs in the area of SW 127 Av., he suggests using these funds to add to/repave the path.
JC: *He will discuss this with the park mgr.*
- ET: Along SW 211 St., a unique bike lane/bus lane design was constructed.
JC: This was a 6-lane, divided roadway from US-1 to H.E.F.T. The outside lane was converted to parking and bike lanes, with intermittent bus bays as a demonstration project. Since buses use more space than parked automobiles, they will also use space where the bike lanes are; in these areas, both modes share the same space. Bus drivers and cyclists have to make conscious decisions to avoid conflicts. Similarly right-turning vehicles share space with cyclists at intersections (where parking has been eliminated). ET: The striping suggests that the bike lanes are to the left of the right-turn lanes.

JC: *He will do a field review.*

- ET: Would like to have the Coral Reef path, from US-1 to SW 147 Av. receive a number. This would cost approx. \$45,000.

JC: The official path runs towards MetroZoo entrance, (near SW 127 Av.)

ET: There are wide sidewalks until SW 147 Av. with limited intersections.

JC: A piece of that roadway is FDOT property. They would have to agree to this.

ET: SW 147 Av. is where the Black Creek Trl. project intersects.

JC: *Will perform a traffic count in the area.* The path has a number; signage is gone.

ET: Additionally, the Biscayne Trl. extension from SW 248-328 Sts. should be a part of County Bike Route 5.

JC: *This will be done when M-DP&R paves the trail. Future extensions of this trail to Card Sound Rd. will have the same number.* Proper signage and striping at then endpoints are all being planned.

ET: The Biscayne-Everglades Greenway is being planned with two-alternative routes. The 1st (northern) route is aligned to the C-113 canal. The 2nd (southern) is the east-west route of the Biscayne Trl. (as proposed by the SDGN.) Both should be numbered.

JC: The southern route has already been assigned a number. He would like SFWMD to open the gates and include signage, allowing people to use the unpaved trail.

- *The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.*